



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,018	05/29/2001	Neil Roberts	ST 98027	1295

23416 7590 08/20/2003

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP
1220 N MARKET STREET
P O BOX 2207
WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

GITOMER, RALPH J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/763,018	Applicant(s) ROBERTS ET AL.	
	Examiner Ralph Gitomer	Art Unit 1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The amendment received 4/29/2003 has been entered and claims 9-18 are currently pending in this application.

The rejections of record under 35 USC 101, 102(b) and (e) and 112, second paragraph are hereby withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims and arguments presented. However, note the new rejections following. A new reference is now applied, hence this Office Action is made non-final.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given. The abstract as presented is in non-standard format.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 is not written in standard method terminology where method steps are positively recited as gerunds. In claim 16 "the liquid phase", and "the intensity" lack antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sabatier.

Sabatier (J of Applied Poultry Res) entitled "Method of Analysis for Feed Enzymes" teaches on page 411, column 1, the measurement of dye release from a defined substrate coupled to a dye (substrate chromophore) works on specified substrates. The analysis consists of a measurement of the release of the chromophore in a defined time interval under specified conditions. On page 412 Table 4 various buffers are shown.

All the features of the claims are taught by Sabatier for the same function as claimed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatier.

See the teachings of Sabatier above.

Claim 16 differs from Sabatier in that it recites there are two phases that are separated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made in view of the teachings of Sabatier to create a liquid phase and separate any solids prior to determining because the feeds of Sabatier are solids that are dissolved in liquids and solids remaining are known to interfere with light based measurements. The separation of liquid and solids in determinations where one is known to interfere with the other is old in this art.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatier as applied to claim 16 above, in further in view of Turner.

The teachings of Sabatier are found above.

The claim differs from Sabatier in it recites the reagent is in the form of a solid bead.

Turner (6,001,587) entitled "Chemically Specific Patterning on Solid Surfaces Using Surface Immobilized Enzymes" teaches in the abstract, substrates may be immobilized on various surfaces. In column 1 lines 33-38, immobilized enzyme substrates are well known. In many places in the document, particles of various types, sizes, and shapes are shown including beads.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention as made to employ the beads of Turner in the method of Sabatier because immobilizing any desired substrate to perform a reaction with the expected result is old in this art as taught by Turner. No unexpected results are seen in the claimed immobilized substrate.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatier as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Bio-Red Labs.

The teachings of Sabatier are found above.

The claims differ from Sabatier in that they recite special features of the container.

See the teachings of Bio-Red Labs in the Office Action of 10/25/2002.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention as made to employ the container of Bio-Rad Labs in the method of Sabatier because the container is a standard column container and known to be well suited to combining and reacting components.

The following references are cited of interest:

Burianova (Animal Feed Science and Tech) teaches determining cellulase in feeds.

Walsh (J Animal Science) teaches detection of glucanase in animal feed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ralph Gitomer whose telephone number is (703) 308-0732. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on (703) 308-1235. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 1651

308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.



Ralph Gitomer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651

August 1, 2003

RALPH GITOMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200